A U M

Be cheerful also, and seek not external help, nor the tranquillity which others give. A man must stand erect, not be kept erect by others.

—MARCUS AURELIUS ANTONINUS.

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XVIII July, 1930 No. 9

PERFECTIBILITY

MANKIND must sooner or later arrive at perfection: either the perfection of evil, or the perfection of good; must either become a complete conscious embodiment of Divine or of infernal nature. "Human nature" is neither the one nor the other, but admixture of the two, and hence as such cannot survive in the race or in the individual.

Perfection does not lie in dogmas of Infallibility, but in the energy and understanding of those "strivers for perfection" who, seeing their own mistakes, profit by them, and so turn seeming evils into power for good.

The Masters of Wisdom are Themselves the living embodiments of the Doctrine of the Perfectibility of Man. They work incessantly toward that great end for all Their younger Brothers—ourselves and all other men. The practical realization of Universal Brotherhood is Their Object, as it should be that of every man—above all, of every Theosophist. That realization can never come to any of us either by shutting our eyes to mistakes or by dwelling on them, any more than by continued attempts to "carry water on both shoulders." The Path of Perfection is not one of compromise, of palliation. It is "narrow" indeed, but it is *straight*. Not through any acquisition of "powers," not by means of any environment, not by any application of the methods of science or religion, can that Path be found and followed. All these represent merely different schemes for the aggrandizement of self. The Path lies in the *right use* of the knowledge, the powers, the environment now ours under Karma: in our daily inner and outer life in all its bearings and relations.

FREEWILL AND KARMA

WITH but few exceptions, no other problem of philosophy has given rise to so much discussion, argument and misunderstanding as that of freewill. To state the case clearly from the viewpoint of the philosophy of Theosophy, it amounts to this: Does man have the power to choose? For the word "freewill" is really a misnomer. The question is not whether the "will" is free, but whether the individual is free to determine which course of action he will follow. The will itself flows from the "spiritual man" along the grooves of thought, action, and habit determined by desire. The will is the omnipresent power of the all-pervasive spirit, and since the spirit *per se* is free, so also is the will, but limited to a greater or lesser extent by the form which it energizes. Hence not an atom is free from this power, but, endowed with consciousness of its own kind, it acts within the limits of the law.

Just as the lower nature of man is necessary for the higher, just as the lower is the means whereby there is called forth the latent powers of the higher, so also desire brings into manifestation the will. The lower nature used ignorantly and selfishly, the corresponding powers and faculties are coarse and of little power; when used discriminatingly and selflessly, wisdom and strength combine. When the motivating nature of the being is energized by selfish and personal desires, the will is transformed into brute energy; when the actuating motives are altruistic and impersonal, the Self unimpeded and unbound acts through its pristine and dynamic first-born power—the sovereign Will.

Why is this so?

We must remember that Man really is enshrouded and involved in matter; man is consciousness, the light of which has been gradually obscured by layer after layer of descending stages of life. As the ancient records teach, "The Self shines in all, but in all It does not shine *forth*." The more man depends upon his original, undifferentiated Self, the stronger, the more powerful and purer will the energizing power be. An approximation of this idea on a lower plane is seen in physics, where with every discovery of further divisions of matter, finer and stronger forces are brought to light. Man is rooted in cosmic principles, and a clear understanding of the problem of freewill depends upon a correct understanding of the nature and origin of man.

Man, then, is a ray of the One Self, but when encased in matter,

he becomes identified with a particular form and thinks that he is a personal, separate being. That man is a separate entity is true, but only a *portion* of the truth. Man is like an iceberg from one point of view; the greater part of him is submerged and hidden from sight. Through ignorance of this fact there arise false conclusions, erroneous conceptions, and a distorted purview of world-processes. Relative truth, *samvritti,* is the origin of the world's delusions. To perceive the Greater, Unbounded Self in all men and to act from that basis is the beginning of freedom. More man is encased and immersed in matter, the less the *exercise* of his power to choose. Less man is material and selfish, the more quickly takes place the sloughing off of the accretions of the ages, of the sheaths obscuring man's true Self, until he stands in his own unbounded spiritual Self—"the living power made free in him, that power which is HIMSELF . . ."

Because man is a spiritual being, a soul, he is a self-determining entity. The soul is a center of self-consciousness, and that is the essence of man. The thinking entity contacts matter below, but above, the Higher Self extends into infinity. There is no one outside of man who can impose those restrictions or limitations which *he* alone has determined in the past.

Materialism, irrationally denying the concatenation of causes and effects originating from and rebounding to a being during a long series of alternate periods of activity and rest (or reincarnation), perceives but the phenomenal effects rebounding upon man in the physical world. Thus the iron-bound doctrine of Fate, with its twin progeny of heredity and environment, which seem inescapable and hopeless, making of man a slave and irresponsible being. Man is bound only by two things—his past, and his ignorance: these two are in reality one. Whatever courses of thought, feeling and action present themselves to man, themselves the effect of the concatenation of a long past line of causes and effects produced by himself, he has the choice of determining which one he will follow. The greater the knowledge, the greater will be the range of his power of choice, for there are degrees of freedom, ranging from the freedom of the average man to that of the perfected Man with power over space and time, mind and matter.

The objection is often brought forward that man is not really free to choose because his choice is determined for him by his incentives, the strongest of which wins. For example, a man has three or four alternatives put before him: which course of action, which line of thought will he follow? The mechanists say that the motive which is the most attractive determines his conduct. That is true, but again

it is a *partial* truth, the greater portion of which is obscured and uncognized. Motives do not exist of themselves, but exist only in relation to a being. Motives are the projections of actuating causes from a person. Can we conceive of "working" without someone performing that action? Or of any motive without its acting co-efficient? All motives are the expression of the self; be it the lower or the spiritual self; hence a motive comes into existence as a result of self's desires and needs.

The motives of the lower self, the personal man, are brought into existence by habit and contact with nature, while those of the higher are spontaneously produced from within itself. A man acting entirely from his lower nature is making but little use of his power to choose, to rise above conditions in which he is immersed. Through sorrow and pain which inviolably follow selfishness, his nature compels him to think and inquire, to ask the question which is the beginning of philosophy: WHY? At this point the Man begins to assert himself, and to take hold of the "lower self" and subjugate it. Self-control implies freewill, the power to re-create the lower self and make of it an efficient instrument. As the lower is raised and purified, so concomitantly the higher enters into and energizes it to impersonal action.

Thus, man has the power which enables him to *over-ride* circumstances; and with Self-knowledge there arises the dynamic power of Self-control, producing Self-expression. Theosophy does not deny the limiting and binding character of heredity and environment, but explains that these are the material coefficients of the individual's own past illimitable life; furthermore, Theosophy adds to these two factors a most important one which is little, if at all, recognized by the great majority, and that is the self-determining faculty of the soul. Man is the creature of *self-made* circumstances, and recognition of the fact gives power; Knowledge of the Self; Knowledge of the Law.

With this Divine Knowledge we can take our life and evolution into our own hands and never complain nor "stand bewildered before the mystery of our own making and the riddles of life that *we will not solve* and then accuse the great Sphinx of devouring us," nor shut our eyes "to the great truth that man is himself his own saviour as his own destroyer."

THE SURVIVAL OF THE FITTEST

WHILE the title of this article is borrowed from the phraseology of the modern evolutionists, it would be aside from the purpose of the magazine THEOSOPHY to deal with a mere exposition of Darwinian theory. It is, however, pertinent to put a question thus: "The Survival of the Fittest: does its basis rest in the Darwinian teaching of the relentless struggle for existence or in the Theosophical teaching of selfless sacrifice?"

In these days, when some of the former proponents of Darwinism are making onslaughts on that theory of evolution, especially in regard to the descent of man from the anthropoids (see address of Dr. Henry Fairfield Osborn before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Dec. 28th, 1929), no Theosophist need apologize for reiterating and holding fast to the teachings of the timeless past. In this connection it was predicted on page 646 of the *Secret Doctrine,* Vol. II, as well as in other places in H. P. Blavatsky's writings, that "the hour is rapidly approaching when the current teaching about the descent of man from an Ape-like mammal will be regarded with less respect than the formation of Adam out of clay, and of Eve out of Adam's rib."

In regard to the phase of evolution under consideration, namely "the survival of the fittest", Theosophy teaches the strange and paradoxical doctrine (to modern science, of course), that *real* survival is dependent upon ceaseless sacrifice for the good of ALL life; and that the kind of survival based on an intense struggle for individual existence is *un*real and wholly *mayavic*. But what does profane science care for the distinction between reality and *maya*? This is a pair of opposites it leaves to the metaphysician and the dreamer. The "circle pass-not" for science is bounded by the five physical senses and that portion of the intelligence which functions through the physical brain. The circle pass-not of the occultist takes in a sphere which includes invisible as well as visible nature. It includes the metaphysical, the spiritual and the noumenal. In this larger sphere the occultist sees other factors at work than merely that struggle for existence observed by modern science. In the light of these other factors operative on inner and higher planes, the occultist recognizes that the crux of the whole matter lies in the distinction between the Real and the Illusionary. He does not consider the contemplation of this distinction as a waste of time or as unworthy of true science.

In the *Theosophical Glossary* under the definition of *maya,* it is

stated, "In Hindu philosophy that alone which is changeless and eternal is called *reality;* all that which is subject to change through decay and differentiation and which has therefore a beginning and an end is regarded as *mâyâ*—illusion." In the second chapter of the *Bhagavad-Gita* Krishna declares: "There is no existence for that which does not exist, nor is there any non-existence for what exists. By those who see the truth and look into the principles of things, the ultimate characteristic of these both is seen." On pages 31 and 32 of *The Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge,* we find the following:

> "Maya is the perceptive faculty of every Ego which considers itself a Unit separate from, and independent of, the One infinite and eternal SAT, or 'be-ness.' . . . Now, although no two people can see things and objects in exactly the same way, and that each of us sees them in his own way, yet all labour more or less under illusions, and chiefly under the great illusion (Maya) that they are, as personalities, distinct beings from other beings, and that even their *Selves* or Egos will prevail in the eternity (or sempiternity, at any rate) as such; whereas not only we ourselves, but the whole visible and invisible universe, are only a temporary part of the one beginningless and endless WHOLE, or that which ever was, is, and will be."

Science mourns the transient nature of the mere forms and embodiments of life—all of which, having a beginning, *must* have an end. It is only life as essence which is beginning-less, endless and eternal. It is alone in the metaphysical and spiritual explanation of things that are to be found solutions to the baffling problems presented to the materialistic concept of evolution, and the true meaning seen in those shibboleths of modern science—"the struggle for existence", and "the survival of the fittest". In direct antithesis to the Darwinian theorems, Theosophy teaches that the evolutionary impulse within and behind all life is one of constant sacrifice, and those alone survive as "individualities" whose sacrifices are unconditioned. Theosophy does not deny a struggle for existence in nature; but it asserts that this struggle is merely an incidental, an intermediate and a passing phase of a process whose end is perfection through universal sacrifice.

> "The whole order of nature evinces a progressive march towards *a higher life.* There is design in the action of the seemingly blindest forces. The whole process of evolution with its endless adaptations is a proof of this. The immutable laws that weed out the weak and feeble species, to make room for the strong, and which ensure the 'survival of the fittest,' though so cruel in their immediate action—all are working toward the grand end. The very *fact* that adaptations *do* occur, that the fittest *do* survive in the struggle for existence, shows that what

is called 'unconscious nature' is in reality an aggregate of forces manipulated by semi-intelligent beings (Elementals) guided by High Planetary Spirits (Dhyan Chohans), whose collective aggregate forms the manifested *verbum* of the unmanifested LOGOS, and constitutes at one and the same time the MIND of the Universe, and its immutable LAW." (*S. D.* I, 277-8).

"As above, so below," repeats the Hermetic Philosopher, deriving his inspiration from the "Sons of the Fire-Mist." "As below, so above," insists the modern evolutionist, deriving his inspiration from the children of the jungle. "Physical evolution, as modern science teaches it, is a subject for open controversy; spiritual and moral development on the same lines is the insane dream of a crass materialism." (S. D. II, 650). There seems to be an impression in the minds of most people that the so-called scientific authorities are entitled to great respect and implicit confidence because they are engaged in an absolutely impersonal search for truth, with no preconceived motives and biases of any kind. In studying the origin of the modern concepts of the "struggle for existence" and the "survival of the fittest", we discover a strange and tell-tale fact, and that is, that the source and inspiration of both of these ideas is no other than Malthus. Malthus wrote an *Essay on Population* in the early part of the nineteenth century in which he enunciated the theory that the realization of a happy society will always be hindered by the miseries consequent on the tendency of population to increase faster than the means of subsistence. His famous formula was, "Population increases in a geometrical, food in an arithmetical ratio." This Malthusian doctrine followed close in the wake of the French Revolution, and the general social unrest and upheaval throughout Europe; and it was avidly seized upon in certain circles which were being blamed for the sufferings of the masses. Nature and not man was responsible for all the vexing social and political problems. In the *Britannica* article on Darwin we find the following:

"In October, 1838, he (Darwin) read *Malthus on Population,* and his observations having long since convinced him of the struggle for existence, it at once struck him 'that under the circumstances favourable variations would tend to be preserved, and unfavourable ones to be destroyed. The result of this would be the formation of new species. Here, then, I had a theory by which to work' ".

In the *Britannica* article on Alfred Russel Wallace is the following:

"Finally in February, 1858, when he was lying muffled in blankets in the cold fit of a severe attack of intermittent fever at Ternate, in the Moluccas, he began to think of Malthus's *Essay on Population,* and to use his own words, 'there suddenly

flashed upon me the *idea* of the survival of the fittest'. The theory was thought out during the rest of the ague fit, drafted the same evening, written out in full in the two succeeding evenings, and sent to Darwin by the next post."

The idea that the work of the two pioneers of modern evolution was the result of a purely impersonal and scientific observation of nature receives a rude shock when we discover that both of these naturalists were "meditating with a seed," as Pantanjali would put it. In the back of the minds of Darwin and Wallace was a troublesome *human* problem that cried out for explanation and solution. That explanation and that solution they looked for and claimed they found in the lower kingdoms of nature, especially in the animal kingdom. Darwinism has made so profound an impression upon materialistic science, the doctrine of the relentless struggle for individual survival has been believed in so implicitly, that the leaders in every department of learning have adjusted their views and theories in the light of this teaching. Darwinism may, therefore, be said to have formed a new axis around which turned and still turns a whole host of new theories, new speculations and new hypotheses in every branch of mundane knowledge.

It is of special interest to trace the attempts at readjustment to Darwinism in the field of sociology. In human society it was very evident that there were other factors at work besides the struggle of each unit to maintain its individual existence before all else. The professors in this field were obliged to strain Darwinian evolution almost to the breaking point in order to make it fit those institutions and aspirations in human society which otherwise belied the conclusions drawn from observation of the rest of nature. Altruism, selflessness and sacrifice to the limit—how could these be reconciled with "the struggle for existence" and "the survival of the fittest"? This is what our scientists, psychologists and sociologists have been and still are trying to do. No theory is too absurd so long as it accounts for the noblest aspirations of the human spirit in the instinctive doings of the animal world. This is indeed, as H.P. B. says, "the insane dream of crass materialism." Even the most misanthropic, blasé and cynical scientist has not been able to disregard his humanity; and upon close examination it will be found that all true scientific researches are motivated by troublesome *human* problems, veritable social skeletons, which have to be explained. Buddha was also oppressed by the sorrows, the sufferings, the decay and the inevitable death of all beings; but Buddha accounted for human suffering in *animality*, rather than in animals. The cause of sorrow was man's ignorance that he is

Spirit and in consequence of that ignorance falling a prey to the illusions of matter. It is not survival in matter which is the end and aim of evolution, but survival in Spirit. Survival in Spirit is based on the recognition of the interdependence of all evolving units, and the duty of aiding the orderly and harmonious unfoldment of all grades and conditions of life. There is nothing tragic in the mere break-up of forms. Destruction is ever followed by regeneration, and every tearing down is merely the struggle of the indwelling life for a greater building-up.

Before the profane scientist can rear a temple on the rock of Truth, he must first tear down the structures built on the quicksands of illusion. This preparatory work of destruction must start with himself. Buddha, who followed the path of his predecessors, showed the way, even twenty-five hundred years ago. This prince not only gave up all preconceived ideas, and declared himself ready to learn from anyone; but he surrendered his rights to a Kingdom, as well as every earthly advantage and rank, and took his place at the side of the lowliest of mortals. When our scientists will do as much, they, too, will see "the light that never shone on sea or land". But so long as they strive to be *something* in the eyes of man, Nature will never give up those secrets which are reserved only for the pure in heart. They alone are pure in heart, who have overcome the Great Heresy —the illusion of separateness. Having overcome this illusion, they live in ALL, and ALL lives in them. Only those are fittest and are worthy of survival who not only share their lives with the lives of the whole of nature, but who do not even distinguish between the two. Only as each consciously becomes the ONE LIFE may it be said that he has consummated the aim of evolution and joined those who are the survival of the fittest. Masters of Compassion are the fulfillment of the purpose of life.

THE PERMANENT LIEN

CHARACTERISTIC of human love is a sense of ownership, of possession. Whatever the relationship of the object of affection to the person who feels it, that feeling is too often for *my* lover, *my* husband, *my* child, *my* sister or brother, *my* friend. "How beautiful!" we often say, upon noting some expression of such human love. It is the beauty of the love itself that we feel, while the possessory aspect of the human relationship is submerged for the moment. The former *is* beautiful and partakes of the divine; the latter is separative, selfish, human rather than divine.

If we could realize that we do not *own* anybody, what an easing, oiling and beneficent adjustment of human relationships would ensue! What a change in the tension of family-life! We say it is because we love the other that we want that other to look his or her best, be mannered thus and so, speak in such and such a way—never realizing that it is of ourselves we are making a sort of "god", in trying to turn the other into a model of our own designing. Doubtless we do love the other, but often it is our own idea of that other we love still more. We want him as we would have him. We *shall* have that—in Devachan, if we are so misfortunate as to be unable to avoid that blissful state! Meantime it were wiser for that other, and for us, to let him be himself. Perchance that self is better than the imagined "self" we would form and perpetuate. Anyway, it will be his own; we shall not have assumed the duty of another, nor interfered with another who might assume his own responsibility, as eventually he must.

Self-expression is the divine prerogative of every Soul, embodied or disembodied. Where such self-expression disregards the rights of others, it requires checking and adjustment. Nature herself, and the general give and take of human life, will ordinarily supply these needs, though if one stands in certain Karmic relationships towards others, brotherly consideration may indicate the desirability and fitness of direct aids of a proper character, in addition to right example. But when we want the self-expression of others to conform to our own ideas of what their self-expression ought to be, excusing our interference by referring it to "love", it is love of ourselves, of our own ideas and notions, that actuates us—not love for the other.

If one will but notice, he shall discover that the disparities he sees in his loved fellows, between their modes and the modes that please him, are largely centred around trifles—inconsequentialities. Life

is too full of important relations and activities to be made complex and friction-full by over attention to trifles. To try to gain some sense of life's fullness, real purpose, and the amplitude of time—to glimpse a little of the Real, in short—this effort and this required persistency will tend to put trifles back into their true relation in our lives, and effect a release from, and cure of, the curious and stultifying manifestations of human love. Then shall the best aspect of it become joined to the real love which is divine, unite itself with that from which it has never actually been separate, for all the pettinesses that have seemed to flow from it. They were but sparks shot off from the emery-wheel of the personality in its useful friction with the personalities of others. To mistake such sparks for the incandescent glow and deep abiding fire of divine love, is to act as if one single human incarnation were the whole of life, instead of a brief, shuttling day in the busy eternity and permanence of the Soul.

The "personal God idea" is exceedingly subtle in its manifestations. It persists in the human minds of students of Theosophy, because those minds are yet the mind of the Race, sustaining yet in some degree every idea the Race holds—and exhibiting each in some measure, as natural circumstance provides natural opportunity. This "god" is a lien between each student and all others who entertain it—an affinity that damns, instead of saving. Jehovah will live just so long as human Jehovahs, male or female, vitalize that awful image with human thoughts and acts. The thoughtful student will seek the Jehovah sedulously in himself—finding the idol all too often and too unexpectedly where Jehovahs least should be. Exercise and dispassion will sometime lead to the discovery and realization of a better lien, truer, deeper, more permanent. It is there now, has been there all the time, will ever be there—the lien of the own Nature of all. Its expression is Divine Love, in whatever terms: charity, brotherly consideration, compassion, unselfishness, willingness that others should live their own lives, non-ownership of any or anything—even one's self. "The Self is in all, but in all it does not shine forth." That it shall shine forth in us is our primary work—secondary too, and for all time, in very truth. By that shining we shall find the gleam in all others, stimulate the broadening of its Ray, in us, in them. We shall never, never accomplish this by trying to "own" another; but we can broaden our sympathies and increase our understanding by trying to put ourselves in their place. This practice is a destroyer of idols in more ways than one; it replaces them with something better—a perception of the Soul's needs, and the growing intelligence called for to fulfill them.

SCIENCE AND THE SECRET DOCTRINE

XXIII

ACCORDING to Theosophy, the past, present and future of mankind is as intimately bound up with the convolutions and convulsions of the globe—that vast *living* entity whose *brain-cells* are the human beings therein—as any human tissues are involved for life and death with the organism of which they are part. Geological changes react upon man; man acts upon the globe, unconsciously to himself, unto the creation of cataclysms of a gigantism but dimly dreamed of in modern science. According to the *Secret Doctrine,* the progress of the race is marked off in vast periods, during each of which certain special characteristics are developed, certain lines of Karma engendered; and each period is cut off from its predecessors and successors by convulsions which send the ocean bottoms skyward, and plunge mountain ranges into the depths, to the salutary end that each new race may have a clean, if barbaric, beginning on fresh soil, unencumbered by the débris of the ages.

The *primary* difficulty in the scientific acceptance of such doctrines is that the rule of *intelligent law* over human affairs and the geological changes therewith interlocked, is necessarily involved; and however much *lip-service* the pious scientist renders to putative religion—for that is now the current intellectual fashion—he balks most energetically at "superstition" when brought face to face with its practical workings—especially when the humble and "unlearned" Theosophist presents himself as the unprepossessing mouthpiece of the gods!

Leaving all that aside, however, is there warrant in geological fact for these giant submersions and elevations; for the *fact* taught in Theosophy, that there once existed a huge continent in the midst of what is now the Atlantic, and that this continent shall once more in part bare its face to the sunlight? There is. Prof. Vening Meinesz[1] states that a great mountain system is slowly forming under water and that its peaks are now known as the East Indies.

Now, according to the *Secret Doctrine,* the first Great Submersion—for the fragments of Atlantis survived down to about 10,000 years ago—took place in mid-Miocene times, when, incidentally, science does not in general yet recognize the presence of man on the

[1] *Science Supplement,* Oct. 12, 1928.

earth. According, then, to Dr. Charles Schuchert, of Yale University, the "fourth diastrophic time began late in the Miocene," being of greatest force during the Pliocene (the date of submersion of Ruta and Daitya), it brought about the great elevation of the American-Antillean mountains and the over-deepening of the Carribean Sea. The crustal movements, he says, were many extensive "block-faultings" with local foldings. This region does not appear to have been the principal center of Atlantean submersions, but somewhat to the Southwest thereof. *It is most significant that these portions, which appear to have been completely submerged only somewhat after the principal body of Atlantis, lie between the civilized center of Atlantis and the great ruins of South America,* which the *Secret Doctrine* says were "probably of Atlantean Origin." Evidences, in fact, abound to prove a gradual migration from the Atlantean center to the Americas, its route and speed governed by the submersions which took place over hundreds of thousands of years.

There is plentiful evidence in other regions, to show the instability of continents. The fossils of sea animals of Cretaceous times have been found in Crooked River Canyon, near Bend, Oregon.[2] This establishes the fact that the ocean once swept this country. And the *Secret Doctrine* teaches that the lands of the Americas, like those of the Himalayas, rose as Atlantis sank. In the Pacific, and harking back to the still older "Lemuria," we have Falcon Island, a mile long and 300 feet high, which has made an appearance in many places since 1885. It has once more appeared, 45 miles north of Nukuolofa.[3] More important for present purposes is the fact that a great drainage project, involving the damming of a great part of the North Sea, has revealed the existence of a submarine cliff running from the River Humber on the English coast to the northern tip of Denmark, and which originated when the European lands were higher than now. Europe, according to Theosophical teachings, occupies the place in human and geological history which Atlantis did a few thousand years before the catastrophe, and is already slowly sinking; the British Isles, according to a Master's letter of last century, will be first to go.

Meantime, on the California coast, foundation borings made by State Highway Engineers for a large bridge revealed one elevation and two submersions of the coast between Los Angeles and San Diego, amounting to at least one hundred feet, and of rather recent geological origin. They also confirm the indication of the

---

[2] *Washington Post,* Feb. 14, 1929.
[3] *Washington Post,* Jan. 30, 1928.

"San Onofre Breccia"[4] that a great lost Pacific continent once existed and deposited material along the present coast.

So much for the latest units in the endless stream of *geological* evidence; and in fact Atlantis as a *prehistoric* continent is quite respectfully spoken of in science. But as a humanly populated and even highly civilized land? Of course to begin with, the "animal ancestry" myth has to be gotten out of the way, since the chronology will not permit of both theories! But that is coming. In passing, however, the humble insect species "trechinae" shows the probable former connection between Africa and South America and Asia and North America, both of which are taught by the *Secret Doctrine*.[5]

As a result of recent discoveries, Dr. Oliver P. Hay, of the Carnegie Institution, maintains that human beings existed in America during the Pleistocene—which if fully accepted will explode the "ape-man" theory. Dr. Hrdlicka believes that the Cro-Magnon "cave-men" of the Old Stone Age in Europe contributed to the American Indian stock—which is exactly what is indicated by the *Secret Doctrine*—with the addenda that the connection was through the Canary Island Guanches, an idea with which science has been decidedly flirting of late. As to these Stone Age men, G. Baldwin Brown, in his *Art of the Cave Dweller*,[6] gives their talents high praise. They had an extraordinary knowledge of nature, the three-dimensional secret later lost during the European Renaissance, and many affinities to modern impressionism. This art is much dealt with by the *Secret Doctrine*, Madame Blavatsky stating that it was an *atavistic flare* of Atlantean genius, appearing in its degenerating descendants. As to the "modern impressionism"—why not, when the present races are so largely a reunion of Atlantean Egos? Prof. Marcel Baudoin[7] found symbols and a carved head, resembling the art of the Mayas of Central America, on a submerged rock off the French coast. It dates presumably back to 9000 years ago—just about the time, according to the *Secret Doctrine*, when the last Atlantean fragments were struggling for foothold on European soil. French villagers nearby show the unmistakable Mayan nose. Prof. Baudoin concedes the entire point.

Alfredo de Sanjos claims that Egyptian, Phoenician, and Carthaginian civilization existed in Brazil and other parts of South America 4000 years ago.[8] Said Madame Blavatsky in 1877:

---

[4]"Science and the Secret Doctrine," THEOSOPHY, Dec. 1926.
[5]*Science*, Sept. 14, 1928.
[6]*Manchester Guardian Weekly*, Jan. 11, 1929.
[7]Hearst papers, Aug. 4, 1929.
[8]Associated Press, Jan. 9, 1929.

> We feel every day as certain that some of the peoples of Central America will be traced back to the Phoenicians and the Mosaic Israelites, as we do that the latter will be proved to have persistently stuck to the same idolatry—if idolatry there is—of the sun and serpent-worship, as the Mexicans. (*Isis Unveiled*, I, 555).

Excavations in the Guadalquivir River tying in with recent German finds near Tunis, are thought to indicate an eastern end of Atlantis.[9] These, according to the *Secret Doctrine*, should be referred to the European fragments of Atlantis above mentioned.

A curious "lead" is given by Dr. Ernest A. Hootan, of Harvard University, who has written a book covering a thousand years of American Southwestern history.[10] It appears that when Pecos was founded about 800 A.D., its inhabitants included several distinct types of humanity. Skull types resembled negroids, Australian bushmen, Europeans, and Mongols; even one Egyptian type was found! In course of time the Mongol strain dominated the rest. Now Madame Blavatsky states the existence of all these diverse types on Atlantean lands, and such a mixing would follow quite logically from a migration before a cataclysm. What part of the Atlantean submersion would this be? Why not some portion of the Antillean catastrophe falling due in comparatively recent times? Or was Pecos really founded in an immensely greater antiquity than scientifically thought? There is a close connection between the American Indian and many Asiatic types—of Atlantean or semi-Atlantean descent, as the *Secret Doctrine* states. Dr. Thomas Gann, a British archeologist, finds a close resemblance between the Maya ruins of Honduras and the old Cambodian civilization—in fact the veriest laymen can determine that near identity from the photographs. The resemblance, says Dr. Gann, "is beyond coincidence." Dr. Frederick L. Hoffman, of Wellesley, Mass.,[11] remarks that a blue mark often seen upon babies of Mongolian stock is found also upon the American Navajos and some South American Indians. So we have then a linkage between the old European Semites, the Central American Mayas, the American Red Indian, and assorted Asiatic Mongolians! Without giving us much satisfaction as to the migrations and transplantations which led to this result, Madame Blavatsky, long in advance of science, indicated that these relationships do exist, make what we will of them.

Let us advance a little further, into those doctrines as to the

---

[9]Press of April, 1928.
[10]*Washington Evening Star*, Nov. 1, 1928.
[11]*Los Angeles Times*, Sept. 23, 1928.

physical nature of the Atlanteans which perhaps for some time to come will arouse but scorn and contumely from orthodoxy; the teaching that the earlier Atlanteans were giants, and that their characteristics survived in lessening degree down to recent times. Get the "ape-ancestor" delusion out of the way, and make man contemporaneous with the giant animals and there is nothing illogical in the idea; the forces of nature which produced gigantism in one species would produce it in another. But that is for the future. Meantime, the Cro-Magnons and the Gaunches, as also the inland Chinese, were and are of very large stature. But of the later giants who took refuge on the Americas, we have traces and to spare. Evidence has been found near Tapextia in Oaxaca, Mexico, of a giant race destroyed by volcanic eruptions.[12] H. Flagler Cowdon and Chas. C. Cowdon, exploring Death Valley in California (ethnology has just turned its eyes in that direction) found very old fossil human remains, one of a female giant two heads taller than the "mound skeletons."[13] Dr. J. Kroeck, of the college of the Pacific, upholds the theory of a giant race which formerly inhabited the San Joaquin Valley of California. Frank Fesrrara and Earl Cusilidge discovered in Calaveras County a cave filled with 200 huge skeletons. The jaw bones were twice the size of normal men's and the rib formations were as massive as those of steers. Shellfish remains indicated that the people lived there when this section was the shore line.[14]

When, oh when, will orthodox science seriously take up these matters, either to confirm or refute! There is a great reluctance—is its causation *fear?*

And why do we dig up with patient spade these fusty relics of lost continents and lost men? Just because their history is *our* history; the self-generated forces which created their vicissitudes are the currents hourly engendered by ourselves; without knowledge of the past we can no more save our civilization, than a doctor can prescribe intelligently without a case-history!

---

[12] *New York Herald-Tribune*, Jan. 29, 1928.
[13] *Los Angeles Examiner*, Oct. 21, 1928.
[14] *Washington Daily News*, June 3, 1929.

RECOGNITION OF MASTERS

IN THE realms of the arts those things which are superior to others of their class are considered masterpieces, and those whose art they represent are considered masters. The reasons for the recognition of both masterpiece and master are most apparent to those students whose own knowledge of the art is comprehensive, although the appreciation of a masterpiece as such is often noted among the most untutored peasants. The qualities which make the artist a master are resident within him, have been developed by the man himself through long periods of time and experience, and are his by right of conquest. The preservation of the arts depends upon those who make the mastery of art their life work.

That the teachings of Theosophy exist in the world today is due to the Masters who have made that science the end and aim of Their existence. We speak of various periods in the development of an art—its rise, Golden Age, decline and renaissance. The Wisdom Religion also has its periods of decline and obscuration among men, during which the teachings are preserved by the Masters; while its brighter periods are ushered in by Their efforts.

The knowledge possessed by Masters cannot, because of its very nature and the process by which it is acquired, be handed out to others, but the Master, knowing how this knowledge was obtained, may point out the means and methods of acquirement to others. Because the existence of Masters and Their continued presence in the world must of necessity be stressed in any intelligent consideration of Theosophy, some students accept the idea of Masters almost too readily and begin to look for evidences of Masters and Their work before acquiring the education necessary for discernment.

The same holds true with the student who is deeply impressed by the degree of knowledge apparently possessed by certain members of the group he studies with. It puts him in a position at once both dangerous and encouraging—dangerous, because it calls for a greater degree of discernment than he may possess; encouraging, because it shows the evolutionary possibilities of all beings. Some have been heard to make remarks like this, "Mr. So-and-So gives such a brilliant discourse, analyzes questions so wonderfully and answers them so completely that his knowledge of the philosophy is apparently unlimited. He must surely be an Adept." This is a theosophical railroad crossing—heed the danger signals! When we reach this point we are beginning to pay entirely too much attention to *persons*. If

it be true that the promulgation of the philosophy depends upon the efforts of persons, it should be apparent that the philosophy rather than the persons should be studied. Some of the popular religions are promulgated by means of Holy Books which are considered so holy that ridiculous and untrue statements therein receive credence because of the awe in which the books are held. And as to the presence of Adepts in the theosophical assemblies of today, who could answer that question save Adepts themselves? Mr. A. wears a Masonic ring and Mr. B. sees it and thinks Mr. A. a Mason. Unless Mr. B. is also a Mason he cannot know whether or not Mr. A. is one. Very certain it is that an Adept would most of all discourage speculation on this score.

The philosophy of Theosophy is based upon three simple fundamental propositions, indicating One Universal Life, One Law and One Evolutionary Process. These propositions prove themselves by application through the detailed exposition of the teachings, and the application being *universal and without exception* the student will learn to look for the reign of Law in every thing and every circumstance. The man becomes the Master under the same law by which the acorn becomes the oak—and any statements accredited to Masters which are not in accord with this Law are not the statements of Masters. Let each student promulgate the true Law, not speculate, or "peer about" on the nature of others.

In presenting the outline of Theosophy in his "Ocean", Mr. Judge introduces his subject by devoting much of the opening part of that work to some considerations on the nature and work of Masters. After the student has carefully studied the entire book through, he might do well to return to the first chapter and, considering the remarks about Masters in the light shed by the contents of the whole work, ask himself if the statements there and elsewhere in the writings of Judge and H. P. B. are consistent with the philosophy itself. If the Law of Cycles is at all understood, is it strange that the universe incessantly manifests and disappears? And as cyclic law is apparent in the seasons, in life and death, in waking and sleeping, is it strange that there should be periods of ignorance and periods of enlightenment in our world? And as those who have become Masters by reason of the Law are pointing the Law out to others who must follow the cyclic path, need we wonder that only those statements which are in accord with Law as evidenced by all Nature can be attributed to Masters?

This does not indicate that any who are able to make such statements must be Masters. Should the reader now inquire, "Was

H. P. B. a Master? Was W. Q. Judge a Master? Is the teacher of my class an Adept?" he has missed the point of this argument.

The statement is not, "Live the life and you will know who I am," but "Live the life and you will know the Law." Certainly H. P. B. and Mr. Judge never declared themselves to be Masters, and if we indulge in speculations as to their identity we do so, for the present at least, through the expenditure of energy that might well be put to use in learning the Law those two took so much pains to indicate to us. Once this Law is *mastered,* the question of recognition is settled. This is the Law.

Continuous Responsibility

If we believe in the doctrine of the One Life, then every cell in these material bodies must be governed by the same laws. Each cell must be a *life* and have its karma, devachan, and reincarnation. Every one of these cells upon incarnating among the others in our frame must be affected by the character of those it meets; and we make that character. Every thought upon reaching its period dies. It is soon reborn, and coming back from its devachan it finds either bad or good companions provided for it. Therefore every hour of life is fraught with danger or with help. How can it be possible that a few hours a week devoted to theosophic thought and action can counteract—even in the gross material cells—the effect of nearly a whole week spent in indifference, frivolity or selfishness? This mass of poor or bad thought will form a resistless tide that shall sweep away all your good resolves at the first opportunity.

This will explain why devoted students often fail. They have waited for a particular hour or day to try their strength, and when the hour came they had none. If it was anger they had resolved to conquer, instead of trying to conquer it at an offered opportunity they ran away from the chance so as to escape the trial; or they did not meet the hourly small trials that would, if successfully passed, have given them a great reserve of strength, so that no time of greater trial would have been able to overcome them.—W. Q. J.

A RED INDIAN'S VIEWS

IN 1805 the Evangelical Missionary Society sent one Rev. Cram to the Senecas to found a mission. Chief Sagoyewatha, after taking the matter under advisement over night, delivered the following speech, in part, as reprinted in the Los Angeles *Record* for December 16, 1929:

"Friend and Brother: It was the will of the Great Spirit that we should meet together this day . . . Our eyes are opened that we see clearly; our ears un-stopped that we have been able to hear distinctly the words you have spoken. For all these favors we thank the Great Spirit: and HIM only . . . Brother: You say you want an answer to your talk before you leave this place. It is right that you should have one, as you are a great distance from home and we do not wish to detain you. But we will first look back a little, and tell you what our fathers have told us, and what we have heard from the white people.

"Brother: Listen to what we say. There was a time when our forefathers owned this land. Their seats extended from the rising to the setting sun. The Great Spirit had made it for the use of Indians . . . If we had some disputes about our hunting ground they were generally settled without the shedding of much blood.

"But an evil day came upon us, your forefathers crossed the great water and landed here; their numbers were small. They found friends and not enemies. They told us they had fled from their own country for fear of wicked men and had come here to enjoy their religion. They asked for a small seat. We took pity on them: granted their request and they sat down amongst us. We gave them corn and meat; they gave us poison in return. (He means rum).

"At length their numbers had greatly increased. They wanted more land, they wanted our country. Our eyes were opened and we became uneasy. Wars took place. Indians were hired to fight against Indians and many of our people were destroyed. They also brought strong liquor amongst us. It was strong and powerful and has slain thousands.

"Brother: Our seats were once large, and yours small. You have now become a great people and we have scarcely a place left to spread our blankets. You have got our country but are not satisfied; YOU WANT TO FORCE YOUR RELIGION UPON US!

"Brother: Continue to listen. You say that you are sent to instruct us how to worship the Great Spirit agreeably to his mind; and if we do not take heed of the religion which you white people teach we shall be unhappy hereafter. You say that you are right and that we are lost. How do we know this to be

true? We understand that your religion is written in a book. If it was intended for us as well as you, why has not the Great Spirit given it to us, and not only to us, but why did HE not give to our forefathers the knowledge of that book with the means of understanding it rightly? We only know what you tell us about it.

"How shall we know when to believe, being so often deceived by the white people?

"Brother: You say that there is but one way to worship and serve The Great Spirit. If there is but one religion WHY DO YOU WHITE PEOPLE DIFFER SO MUCH ABOUT IT? WHY NOT ALL AGREED, AS YOU CAN ALL READ THE BOOK?

"Brother: We do not understand these things. We are told that your religion was given to your forefathers and has been handed down from father to son. We also have a religion which was given to our forefathers and has been handed down to us their children. We worship in that way. It teaches us to be thankful for the favors we receive; to love each other and be united; WE NEVER QUARREL ABOUT RELIGION. . . .

"Brother: WE DO NOT WISH TO DESTROY YOUR RELIGION, NOR TAKE IT FROM YOU, WE ONLY WANT TO ENJOY OUR OWN!

"Brother: You say you have not come to get our land or our money but to enlighten our minds. I will now tell you that I have been at your meetings and saw you collect from the meeting. I cannot tell what this money was intended for, but suppose that it was for your minister; and if we should conform to your way of thinking perhaps you may want some from us.

"Brother: WE ARE TOLD THAT YOU HAVE BEEN PREACHING TO THE WHITE PEOPLE IN THIS PLACE. THESE PEOPLE ARE OUR NEIGHBORS. WE ARE ACQUAINTED WITH THEM. WE WILL WAIT A LITTLE WHILE AND SEE WHAT EFFECT YOUR PREACHING HAS UPON THEM. IF WE FIND IT DOES THEM GOOD, MAKES THEM HONEST AND LESS DISPOSED TO CHEAT INDIANS, WE WILL THEN CONSIDER OF WHAT YOU HAVE SAID!

"Brother: You have heard our answer to your talk, and this is all we have to say at present. As we are going to part we will come and take you by the hand and hope the Great Spirit will protect you on your journey and return you safe to your friends."

History does not inform us as to whether at the conclusion of the speech the Missionary cheek emulated the natural color of the red brother.

JESUS: INITIATE AND TEACHER

IX

UNLUCKILY for those who would have been glad to render justice to the ancient and modern religious philosophies of the Orient, a fair opportunity has hardly ever been given to them. Of late there has been a touching accord between philologists holding high official positions, and missionaries from heathen lands. Prudence before truth when the latter endangers our sinecures! Besides, how easy to compromise with conscience. A State religion is a prop of government; all State religions are "exploded humbugs"; therefore, since one is as good, or rather as bad, as another, *the* State religion may as well be supported. Such is the diplomacy of official science.

Grote in his *History of Greece,* assimilates the Pythagoreans to the Jesuits, and sees in their Brotherhood but an ably-disguised object to acquire political ascendancy. On the loose testimony of Herakleitus and some other writers, who accused Pythagoras of craft, and described him as a man "of extensive research . . . but artful for mischief and destitute of sound judgment," some historical biographers hastened to present him to posterity in such a character.

How then if they must accept the Pythagoras painted by the satirical Timon: "a juggler of solemn speech engaged in fishing for men," can they avoid judging of Jesus from the sketch that Celsus has embalmed in his satire? Historical impartiality has nought to do with creeds and personal beliefs, and exacts as much of posterity for one as for the other. The life and doings of Jesus are far less attested than those of Pythagoras, if, indeed, we can say that they are attested at all by any *historical* proof. For assuredly no one will gainsay that as a real personage Celsus has the advantage as regards the credibility of his testimony over Matthew, or Mark, or Luke, or John, who never wrote a line of the *Gospels* attributed to them respectively. Withal Celsus is at least as good a witness as Herakleitus. He was known as a scholar and a Neo-platonist to some of the Fathers; whereas the very existence of the four Apostles must be taken on blind faith. If Timon regarded the sublime Samian as "a juggler," so did Celsus hold Jesus, or rather those who made all the pretenses for him. In his famous work, addressing the Nazarene, he says: "Let us grant that the wonders were performed by you . . . but are they not common with those who have been taught by the Egyptians to perform in the middle of the forum for a few oboli." And we

know, on the authority of the *Gospel according to Matthew,* that the Galilean prophet was also a man of solemn speech, and that he called himself and offered to make his disciples "fishers of men."

Let it not be imagined that we bring this reproach to any who revere Jesus as God. Whatever the faith, if the worshipper be but sincere, it should be respected in his presence. If we do not accept Jesus as God, we revere *him as a man.* Such a feeling honors him more than if we were to attribute to him the powers and personality of the Supreme, and credit him at the same time with having played a useless comedy with mankind, as, after all, his mission proves scarcely less than a complete failure; 2,000 years have passed, and Christians do not reckon one-fifth part of the population of the globe, nor is Christianity likely to progress any better in the future. No, we aim but at strict justice, leaving all personality aside. We question those who, adoring neither Jesus, Pythagoras, nor Apollonius, yet recite the idle gossip of their contemporaries; those who in their books either maintain a prudent silence, or speak of "our Saviour" and "our Lord," as though they believed any more in the made-up theological Christ, than in the fabulous Fo of China.

There were no atheists in those days of old; no disbelievers or materialists, in the modern sense of the word, as there were no bigoted detractors. He who judges the ancient philosophies by their external phraseology, and quotes from ancient writings sentences *seemingly* atheistical, is unfit to be trusted as a critic, for he is unable to penetrate into the inner sense of their metaphysics.

Avatars or incarnations were common to the old religions. India had them reduced to a system. The Persians expected Sosiosh, and the Jewish writers looked for a deliverer. Tacitus and Suetonius relate that the East was full of expectation of the Great Personage about the time of Octavius. "Thus doctrines obvious to Christians were the highest arcana of Paganism." (W. Williams: "Primitive History;" Dunlap: "Spirit History of Man.") The Maneros of Plutarch was a child of Palestine; (Plutarch: "Isis and Osiris," p. 17) his mediator Mithras, the Saviour Osiris is the Messiah. In our present *"Canonical Scriptures"* are to be traced the vestigia of the ancient worships; and in the rites and ceremonies of the Roman Catholic Church we find the forms of the Buddhistical worship, its ceremonies and hierarchy. The first *Gospels,* once as canonical as any of the present four, contain pages taken almost entirely from Buddhistical narratives, as we are prepared to show. After the evidence furnished by Burnouf, Asoma, Korosi, Beal, Hardy, Schmidt, and translations from the *Tripitaka,* it is impossible to doubt that the

whole Christian scheme emanated from the other. The "Miraculous Conception" miracles and other incidents are found in full in Hardy's *Manual of Buddhism*. We can readily realize why the Roman Catholic Church is anxious to keep the common people in utter ignorance of the Hebrew *Bible* and the Greek literature. Philology and comparative Theology are her deadliest enemies. The deliberate falsifications of Nenæns, Epiphanius, Eusebius and Tertullian had become a necessity.

The *Sibylline Books* at that period seem to have been regarded with extraordinary favor. One can easily see that they were inspired from the same source as those of the Gentile nations.

Here is a leaf from Gallæus:

"New Light has arisen:
Coming from Heaven, it assumed a mortal form. . . .
——— Virgin, receive God in thy pure bosom—
And the Word flew into her womb;
Becoming incarnate in Time, and animated by her body,
It was found in a mortal image, and a Boy was created
By a Virgin. . . . The new God-sent Star was adored by the Magi,
The infant swathed was shown in a manger. . . .
And Bethlehem was called "God-called country of the Word."
(Plutarch: "Isis and Osiris," p. 17).

This looks at first sight like a prophecy of Jesus. But could it not mean as well some other creative God? We have like utterances concerning Bacchus and Mithras.

"I, son of Deus, am come to the land of the Thebans—Bacchus, whom formerly Semelé (the virgin), the daughter of Kadmus (the man from the East) brings forth—being delivered by the lightning-bearing flame; and having taken a mortal form instead of God's, I have arrived." ("Sibylline Oracles," 760-788.)

The *Dionysiacs,* written in the fifth century, serve to render this matter very clear, and even to show its close connection with the Christian legend of the birth of Jesus:

"Korè-Persephoneia*. . . you were wived as the Dragon's spouse,
When *Zeus,* very coiled, his form and countenance changed,
A Dragon-Bridegroom, coiled in love-inspiring fold . . .
Glided to dark Korè's maiden couch . . .
Thus, by the alliance with the Dragon of Æther,
The womb of Persephonè became alive with fruit,
Bearing Zagreus, the Horned Child."

Here we have the secret of the Ophite worship, and the origin of the Christian later-*revised* fable of the immaculate conception. The

*Pococke considers Zeus a grand lama, or chief Jaina, and Korè-Persephone, or Kuru-Parasu-pani. Zagreus, is *Chakras*, the wheel, or circle, the earth, the ruler of the world. He was killed by the Titans, or Teith-ans (Daityas). The Horns or crescent was a badge of Lamaic sovereignty.

Gnostics were the earliest Christians with anything like a regular theological system, and it is only too evident that it was Jesus who was made to fit their theology as Christos, and not their theology that was developed out of his sayings and doings. Their ancestors had maintained, before the Christian era, that the Great Serpent—Jupiter, the Dragon of Life, the Father and "Good Divinity," had glided into the couch of Semelé, and now, the post-Christian Gnostics, with a very trifling change, applied the same fable to the man Jesus, and asserted that the same "Good Divinity," Saturn (Ilda-Baoth), had, in the shape of the Dragon of Life, glided over the cradle of the infant Mary. In their eyes the Serpent was the Logos —Christos, the incarnation of Divine Wisdom, through his Father Ennoia and Mother Sophia.

Take Paul, read the little of original that is left of him in the writings attributed to this brave, honest, sincere man, and see whether any one can find a word therein to show that Paul meant by the word Christ anything more than the abstract ideal of the personal divinity indwelling in man. For Paul, Christ is not a person, but an embodied idea. "If any man is in Christ he is a new creation," *he is reborn,* as after initiation, for the Lord is spirit—the spirit of man. Paul was the only one of the apostles who had understood the secret ideas underlying the teachings of Jesus, although he had never met him. But Paul had been initiated himself; and, bent upon inaugurating a new and broad reform, one embracing the whole of humanity, he sincerely set his own doctrines far above the wisdom of the ages, above the ancient Mysteries and final revelation to the epoptæ. As Professor A. Wilder well proves in a series of able articles, it *was not Jesus, but Paul who was the real founder of Christianity.* "The disciples were called Christians first in Antioch," say the *Acts of the Apostles.* "Such men as Irenæus, Epiphanius, and Eusebius have transmitted to posterity a reputation for untruth and dishonest practices; and the heart sickens at the story of the crimes of that period," writes this author, in a recent article. ("Evolution," art. Paul, the Founder of Christianity.) "It will be remembered," he adds, "that when the Moslems overran Syria and Asia Minor for the first time, they were welcomed by the Christians of those regions as deliverers from the intolerable oppression of the ruling authorities of the Church."

To maintain their ground Irenæus and his school had to fight hard with the Gnostics. Such, also, was the lot of Eusebius, who found himself hopelessly perplexed to know how the Essenes should be disposed of. The ways and customs of Jesus and his apostles exhibited

too close a resemblance to this sect to allow the fact to pass unexplained. Eusebius tried to make people believe that the Essenes were the first Christians. His efforts were thwarted by Philo Judæus, who wrote his historical account of the Essenes and described them with the minutest care, long before there had appeared a single Christian in Palestine. But, if there were no *Christians,* there were Chrestians long before the era of Christianity; and the Essenes belonged to the latter as well as to all other initiated brotherhoods, without even mentioning the Christnites of India.

As a last word, the *Christian* Gnostics sprang into existence toward the beginning of the second century, and just at the time when the Essenes most mysteriously faded away, which indicated that they were the identical Essenes, and moreover pure *Christists,* viz.: they believed and were those who best understood what one of their own brethren had preached. In insisting that the letter Iota, mentioned by Jesus in *Matthew* (v. 18), indicated a secret doctrine in relation to the ten æons, it is sufficient to demonstrate to a kabalist that Jesus belonged to the Freemasonry of those days; for I, which is Iota in Greek, has other names in other languages; and is, as it was among the Gnostics of those days, a pass-word, meaning the SCEPTRE of the FATHER, in Eastern brotherhoods which exist to this very day.

(Collated from the writings of H. P. B.)
(To be continued)

ORIGIN OF RELIGIONS

The origin of all religions—Judaeo-Christianity included—is to be found in a few primeval truths, not one of which can be explained apart from all the others, as each is a complement of the rest in some one detail. And they are all, more or less, broken rays of the same Sun of truth, and their beginnings have to be sought in the archaic records of the Wisdom-religion. Without the light of the latter, the greatest scholars can see but the skeletons thereof covered with masks of fancy, and based mostly on personified Zodiacal signs.—H. P. B.

FROM A STUDENT'S NOTEBOOK

EVERY embodied Soul is of a certain "company," within which it is natural and at home—without which it feels inconsistent with itself. The right effort lies in finding one's self and one's company. The right sacrifice and the right development are to fulfill one's duty and gain one's fullness of bloom within one's company and for the sake of one's company. Thus the group evolution is furthered—in which growth and richness all units share. All other companies share too in the unfolding, since all are but departments of that Life which is One—divisions, segments, angles, delineations, in the vast and perfect pattern of self-revealing intelligence.

Every company has come down its own path. Each represents that peculiar combination of the qualities, forces and experiences of the whole of sentient life which provides a certain tone in the harmonics of nature, and without which those harmonics would be incomplete. How unintelligent, then, to attempt to force relationships with others, in an effort to provide artificial brotherhood where true homogeneity exists not! How unnatural and subversive of true order to busy one's self with the duties and obligations of other men! Within the *company* is the lawful path to natural duty, natural brotherhood. Fulfilled within the natural "caste," these expressions of right thought, right act and right growth benefit all—and find their right and proportionate summing in the great and complete problem Life has set for itself, and is in process of solving as the cycles roll.

First, the unit finds his company. Then the unit *becomes* the company. Then the unit finds his company's right relation to all the other companies, of whom there are seven. That right relation brings assurance and certainty that each company is included in all the others, that by completely identifying himself with his own company —and fulfilling to it—the unit of any company can assimilate and master not only the knowledge and power his own company has accumulated, but those garnered by all other companies.

Is the unit—the individuality—lost in the process? No. Such units become Maha-Atmas, Great Souls.

> "Individuality is the characteristic of their respective hierarchies, not of their units; and these characteristics vary only with the degree of the plane to which those hierarchies belong: the nearer to the plane of Homogeneity and the One Divine, the purer and the less accentuated that individuality in the Hierarchy."
>
> "Man, . . . being a compound of the essence of all those celestial Hierarchies may succeed in making himself, as such, superior, in one sense, to any hierarchy or class, or even combination of them."

YOUTH-COMPANIONS

"Once more the elder brothers have indicated where the truth—Theosophy—could be found, and the companions all over the world are engaged in bringing it forth for wider currency and propagation."

"JACK, do you think that people today are as bad as the reformers would have us think? A whole lot more wicked than in the past generations?" Ann asked the question of her brother in utmost seriousness. Sometimes, she thought, it was nice to be able "to talk things over" with someone older than herself, and get another point of view. But, of course, he *was* her brother, and if only he wouldn't make fun of her. . .

Jack looked up from his studies to regard his small sister in astonishment. "What made you think that people were 'bad' and 'wicked' these days?" he asked, smiling.

"*I* didn't say that they were," said Ann emphatically. "I'm asking you if it is so. You see," she amplified, "my friend's father is of the reformer type, and every time I go to her house, he starts to lecture me on the wickedness of the youth of today, and I'm rather sure that he includes me because I'm a Theosophist."

"What is your own opinion, Sis? Does he, perhaps, make you feel 'wicked'?"

"No, indeed," replied Ann staunchly. "It makes me feel happier than ever, when he seems to regard me as a poor, miserable sinner. And I feel blessedly thankful that I have contacted Theosophy in this life. It must be terrible to go around looking pessimistically at the whole world. But I have wondered if some of the things he is always talking about aren't partly true—you know, boys and girls, as young and younger than ourselves thinking of nothing but 'a good time,' and thinking they are having one driving at the rate of 65 miles an hour in high-powered cars; being intimately acquainted with the local bootlegger and taking a positive delight in coming home from a party entirely intoxicated. You know, Jack," she continued, "there are such people who live their whole life just liking this, and not liking that, and the only time they will ever do any thinking, or work, is when something interferes with their personal happiness."

"Yes," said Jack, "I know lots of young people just like that, but I didn't expect you to know any at your age."

"What do you expect? I go to school, and furthermore I would like to inform you that I'm not so stupid as you regard me to be."

Ann made her face look as sophisticated as possible. "But what I came to ask you is this. What are Theosophists, who know such conditions exist, going to do about it?"

"I'm afraid not many Theosophists do anything about that or anything else. You know, Theosophists can fall into ruts just as easily as other people. By that I mean," continued Jack, observing his sister's puzzled face, "that most of us take our Theosophy for granted. Oh, yes indeed, we know all about birth, life, and death. The mysteries of science are no mysteries for us. There is hardly a problem in the Universe that we cannot solve, if we want to. And what are we doing with so much knowledge? Most of us just sit down quietly and let it ooze in as if we were a lot of human sponges. I was thinking the other day, how little I do for Theosophy, as an individual. Yes, I know," Jack said hastily, "I go to all the meetings—most all of them—and ask a few questions, take care of the flowers for the meetings, and discuss ideas with our own group, but aside from that I might just as well be a Christian or a Mohammedan, for all the good I do for other people."

"Now, you're the one that is being pessimistic," broke in Ann. "Don't you think that what you do is of some value, and that people can't help noticing that your ideas are different and that you have more . . . more character?" Ann was groping for words.

"That may be true, but that's a sort of negative way of doing things. Theosophists have plenty of chances of doing things for other people which they never think of doing. You know, Ann," Jack looked a little shamefacedly at his sister, "I always used to be scared to death that people might even think of me as a Theosophist! Whenever I had the *'Ocean'* or some other book with me at school, I was always careful that the fellows did not see the cover-page for fear they might think it was funny that I was interested in that sort of thing. Why, you know," he laughed, "that's just plumb ignorance. Funny, how you realize a thing, suddenly like that."

"Yes, I've felt that way myself," confessed Ann.

"I think that lots of Theosophists lack *fire*. There are just a few of them who are not sitting down on the job, but really *work* to promulgate the teaching. And, of course, it is we younger ones who ought to be doing most of the work. Remember H. P. B.'s words: 'Be Theosophists, Work for Theosophy! Theosophy first and Theosophy last, for its *practical* realization alone can save the Western world'—save it from just such conditions as you mentioned. You know, when there are enough egos in the race who have formed a real nucleus of Brotherhood, other higher egos can enter into the

race, and in that way help to elevate the whole mass of humanity. 'The world follows whatever example is set.' But, of course, it's up to us to start *doing* something about it and not let someone else do all the work. Now, say," laughed Jack deprecatingly, "doesn't that sound preachy?"

"That's quite all right," said Ann graciously, "I realize perfectly that you are talking for yourself."

"Yes? Well, just let me catch *you* falling down on the job! Are you ready with your 'Ocean' assignment for tomorrow?"

"Good-bye!" called Ann, the other side of the door. "I *will* be!"

How Great Characters Are Made

If we look at the field of operation in us of the so-called advantages of opportunity, money, travel and teachers we see at once that it all has to do with the brain and nothing else. Languages, archaeology, music, satiating sight with beauty, eating the finest food, wearing the best clothes, travelling to many places and thus infinitely varying impressions on ear and eye; all these begin and end in the brain and not in the soul or character. As the brain is a portion of the unstable, fleeting body the whole phantasmagoria disappears from view and use when the note of death sends its awful vibration through the physical form and drives out the inhabitant. The wonderful central masterganglion disintegrates, and nothing at all is left but some faint aromas here and there depending on the actual love within for any one pursuit or image or sensation. Nothing left of it all but a few tendencies—*skandhas*, not of the very best. The advantages then turn out in the end to be disadvantages altogether. But imagine the same brain and body not in places of ease, struggling for a good part of life, doing their duty and not in a position to please the senses: this experience will burn in, stamp upon, carve into the character, more energy, more power and more fortitude. It is thus through the ages that great characters are made. The other mode is the mode of the humdrum average which is nothing after all, as yet, but an animal.—W. Q. J.

HIDDEN HINTS IN THE SECRET DOCTRINE*

(From p. 252 to p. 260, Vol. I)

By W. Q. J.

ORDER of the Elements Esoterically is, *Fire, air, water, earth, (2nd para)*. Counting up from the earth, the order for the elementals, or the nature spirits in the elements, is: earth elementals, water elementals, air elementals, fire elementals. And it has always been said that those of the fire are the wisest and most distant so far as cognition of or by us is concerned, that the airy ones are also wise, and those of the water dangerous. Those of the earth have been described by seers in the form of gnomes sometimes seen by clairvoyant miners in the depths under us, and of this class also are those that have given rise to the superstition among the Irish respecting the fairies.

Fire in the Preceding Rounds. She says *(p. 253)*, "For all we know, fire may have been pure akasa, the first matter of the builders." The phrase "For all we know" is sometimes to be translated "Thus it was."

The Fifth Element in the Fifth Round. This, as said before in these notes, will be "The gross body of akasa" *(257)*, and "by becoming a familiar fact in nature to all men as air is familiar to us now, will cease to be hypothetical."

What is the Sixth Sense to be? In the first paragraph of page 258 she says that at first there will be a partial familiarity with a characteristic of matter to be known then as permeability, which will be perceived when certain new senses have been developed, and after that this singular characteristic will be fully known, as it will be developed concurrently with the sixth sense. We may therefore argue that she means to describe the sixth sense as one which will (among other things) give to us the power to permeate matter with ourselves. Let some one else now carry this idea further, as it is no doubt correct. It would seem that both the matter-characteristic and the power in man are being here and there exhibited, or else some of the phenomena seen at spiritualistic séances could never have happened; but alas! we need not look for aid there so long as the beloved "spirits from the summerland" continue to hold sway over their votaries.

---

*From *The Path*, February, 1892.

The Earth in its Early Periods. Some students have thought that this globe in its early times when, following the statements in *Esoteric Buddhism,* the human life-wave and so on had not come, there was no life on it, supposing in a vague way that there was, say in the fire-mist time, a mass of something devoid of life. This is contradicted and explained on *page 258* in the *second para,* for: "Thus Occultism disposes of the Azoic age of science, for it shows that there never was a time when the earth was without life upon it." This is asserted for no matter what form or sort of matter thus, "Wherever there is an atom of matter, a particle or a molecule even in its most gaseous state, there is life in it, however latent or unconscious."

Of Spirit and Matter. In the commentary on *p. 258* the author plainly writes, "Spirit is the first differentiation of and in space; and matter is the first differentiation of Spirit." This is a clear statement of what she desired to teach respecting spirit and matter, and as in other places it is said that spirit and matter are the opposite poles of the One—the Absolute—an agreement has to be made between the two. There is no real disagreement, since it is evident that differentiation must proceed in a definite order, from which it results that there must be always one state, plane, place, power, and idea in nature that is above and different from and beyond all others. And when we go beyond spirit, the highest we may speak of is the Absolute, which is the container of the next two—spirit and matter, the latter following the first in order of differentiation. These are said to be coëternal, and, indeed, are so, as far as our minds are concerned, for the reason that we cannot grasp either the first or the second differentiation of the absolute. But because this doctrine of the coëternalness of spirit and matter has been taught, there never being the one without the other also present, some students have fallen into a materialistic view, probably because matter is that which being near to us is most apparent, and others, remaining somewhat vague, do not define the doctrine at all. Spirit and matter are coëternal because they exist together in the absolute, and when the first differentiation spoken of above takes place, so does the second immediately. Hence, except when we are dealing with metaphysic, they must be regarded as the two poles of the one absolute. And the *Bhagavad Gita* does not support the contrary, for it only says there is no spirit without also matter, as it is dealing through the words of Krishna with things as they are *after* the differentiation has taken place.

There is another class of theosophists who speak of the "super-

personal god", asserting at the same time that they do not mean "a personal God," and they are opposed by still another class who point to the well-known denial by H. P. B. of the existence of a personal god. It is in the sentence quoted that both of these may come to an agreement, for the believers in the superpersonal deity can without doubt find support in the lines on *p. 258*. For if spirit is the first, then matter is a grade below it, however fine and imperceptible that distinction may be.

If further we say, as many of us do, that the great inherent ideas of man were given to him by the first great teachers whose descendants and pupils the Adepts are, then we here also see how it is that there is such a wide and universal belief in a God. It must also be the origin of that universal optimism which may be found also in the ranks of the theosophists, who, while for present days are pessimistic, must be called the greatest optimists on the face of the earth. There are many other matters in this sentence. Many a student has puzzled his head very often in trying to discover from where come the impulse and the plan as well as the idea of perfection, for it must as a first thing reside somewhere, whether abstractly or concretely. Perhaps it is here; those students can look here at any rate.

A Mysterious Principle Mentioned. After going for a little space into the formation of this globe by the first builders, she speaks *(page 259)* of a certain *akasic* principle to which no name is given but left in hiatus. But in the note on that page we see, and I am violating nothing in referring to it, that very clearly it is pointed out that the primordial substance of which she then writes "is the very body of those spirits themselves and their very essence." Now in many places in her writings, and also in those of other knowing ones through all time, this primordial substance is said to be one that, once controlled, gives him who has power over it the most transcendent abilities,—sway alike over mind and matter.

She and all of us are quite safe in speaking of it, since there are but few indeed who will see anything in it at all. Yet the few can have the hint if they never got it before. This, however, should always remain as a hint, and there ought to be no attempt to make it clear to science, for nothing will be gained except ridicule and maybe worse.

SOME QUESTIONS ANSWERED

QUESTION: I should very much like to get some clear ideas regarding after-death states. At present, spite of much study, my mind is more or less confused over the different statements on the subject by various theosophical writers. First, are the after-death states and conditions the same for all men?

Answer: How could they be the same for all men? Are all men in the same state and condition here? There is no transforming power in death by which wise men become foolish, good men bad, or the reverse. Statements should not be regarded as if they were *ex cathedra,* and therefore to be accepted or rejected on the mere say-so of some assumed authority. We should use the key given by H. P. B.: Correspondence and analogy. It is the same Man before birth and after death as during earthly life, with the same inherent powers, the same acquired knowledge, the same character and tendencies. Only the conditions are changed; therefore each will act and re-act under the new conditions of attraction and repulsion according to his own nature, whatever that nature may be.

Question: As a man has no physical body, senses and organs, and no physical brain after death, how can he feel and act the same as if he were here?

Answer: Have you not answered your own question? He *cannot* act as he acted here: that is self-evident; therefore he cannot *re-act* as he reacted here. Here, the bodily life and the bodily senses constantly flooded him with fresh impressions; they constituted his link with his fellows, as his expressions flooded them through the same channels. These expressions and impressions formed his mental, physical, and moral food and exercise. Only a small part of this metaphysical content, however, was digested and assimilated by him during earth-life. What became of the rest? It was stored up in his inner, invisible nature—part of it to be worked over during his periods of reflection and memory while living; part of it to be similarly worked out in dreams; other portions to become the seeds of meditation and internal action after death; still other parts to remain dormant until a suitable body and environment should be obtained in a subsequent incarnation in which these seeds could germinate and grow into new expressions with their attendant impressions. We should study man as the permanent Being, his temporary existence on any given plane of Nature as subject to a

four-fold cycle of birth, life, death, and, after passing through the other planes, return or re-birth on the given plane from which we started to observe his migration and transmigrations. In an academic and general sense a week begins on Sunday, and, after the cycle of days, begins anew with the next succeeding Sunday, but any particular day, as say Thursday, can be taken as the starting point of a week, in which case the cycle of days repeats in the same order, and a new week begins the following Thursday. So with the cycle of transformations undergone by Man. In a general or universal sense, that cycle begins in the plane of Spirit, then, by successive stages proceeds downward to physical birth, and, after death, the stages continue in inverse order until the plane of Spirit is once more reached, the whole constituting one single "incarnation," or descent from Spirit to Matter and the return to Spirit.

It may, then, be seen that, although there are seven stages in the cycle there are only four steps or planes or worlds through which the Ego travels: the Spiritual, the Psychical, the Astral, the Physical—and then through the Astral and Psychic back to the Spiritual. Similarly, although there are seven days in any week, the being is never more than three-and-a-half days *away* from Sunday, or whatever particular day is taken as a starting point. We are not to think of the progression of the Ego as a series of starts and stops, but a continuous and unbroken circuit; nor are we to think of progress in straight-line terms: *everything is cyclic*—from a given spot, place, or focus, out and back, through four planes, in seven distinct phases. The unchanging centre of every cycle, small or great, is the Self, the Ego, the Spiritual Man; the changing centres are his "principles," his vehicles, his relations with other beings through them, his modes of communication, of expression and impression. There is a correspondence (reciprocal action and reaction) between all the "principles;" an analogy between existence on one plane and existence on another—but no identity between one "principle" and another, one plane and another, one body or vehicle and another. The Ego is the only Identity there is. Therefore study the changes of state and condition from the standpoint of the unchanging Identity of the Ego or Self, not the other way about—and all the rest becomes easy.

Question: Is the Ego conscious after death? I mean (*a*) is he self-conscious; (*b*) is he aware of the state in which he is; (*c*) is he in actual communication with other men and beings; (*d*) if not, what kind of "seeing" is it that deludes him into thinking he is still on earth, when in fact he is in *"Kama-loka"* or *"Devachan?"*

Answer: (*a*) The Ego is always conscious, because "all is Life," or consciousness, on any and every plane of Nature; there is nothing "dead" except in the conventional and relative sense in which we speak of "sun-rise" and "sun-set." The Ego is always self-conscious, because the word Man or Ego means precisely Self-consciousness—a Noumenon, a Reality, an Identity, not a phenomenon, a quality, or a combination of "principles" or conditions. (*b*) Indirectly, not directly, there are the same stages of birth, growth, maturation, and declension of existence in *Kama-loka* and *Devachan,* as in physical existence, or in the daily cycle of waking, dreaming, sleeping and return. In time, since no state is limitless, the Ego travels *through* it. When he becomes fully aware of the nature of any state—that it *is* a state and no more—he is *out of it.* (*c*) The "communication" is actual, but instinctual, that is, direct not relative. "Intuitional" is a better term than instinctual, but it is of the same nature as instinct among animals, the vital process in plants, osmosis among liquids; in short, being individual and personal to the Ego, it is a *rapport,* an influence given and received, a spiritual and psychic, not an intellectual and volitional interchange, both reason and the discriminative faculty being in abeyance, because there are no contrasts or interferences. From this it will be seen that, for the normal man, there is *no* communication, in the living, human sense, with other beings either in *Kama-loka* or *Devachan,* or with those still on earth. (*d*) The "seeing" is by the Ego's own light, since he is "clothed" in a metaphysical form variously composed. He may be "seeing" by the light of his memories, his fancies, his imaginations, his beliefs and opinions—all created and stored up by him during his earthly existence; or he may be seeing by the light of Knowledge, in which case both Reason and Will are active, and he knows the state for what it is. But this latter status could not be had after death if the Ego did not enjoy it during life. This is self-evident. During life here we are percipient of the most extreme contrasts; will and reason as well as the other "principles" or Soul-powers are all more or less active; and if these advantages of the earthly state and condition do not wake us up to the Reality of Self as distinct from any and all experiences, how could that awakening come in a condition devoid of "opportunities?" Look for the correspondences between the waking and the dreaming states during each 24-hour cycle of the human being, and you have the analogy between his states during life and his states after death. One should not take the statements that *Kama-loka* and *Devachan* are "illusions" and "dreams" in any but

an analogical sense. In "waking" life action and reaction are both external and internal, both volitional and involuntary, because waking life is a *mixed* state, *i.e.*, a state of both Cause and Effect. In dreams and in after-death states, the normal action and reaction is purely internal to the being; they are effect states only, and therefore *unmixed* states; therefore wholly involuntary, since they were not *consciously intended* by the Ego when their causes were set up.

Question: In what respects, if at all, do the after-death conditions and states of the Adept vary or differ from those of the ordinary man?

Answer: They differ after death just as they differ during earthly life. The Adept does not identify Self with any form or state, or changes in either, while in the body; therefore he is free from such identification after death. He knows while alive the difference between good and bad conditions external or internal; enjoys or suffers from them while in them, but is not deceived by them into thinking "I am this; I am that;" or "I was this; I was that." The Adept does not "dream," though he enters that state; he does not "sleep," though he enters that state; he is not "born," though he enters a body; he does not "die," though he quits the body at death. He has realized in himself and for himself the meaning and the verity of the statement in the 13th *Gita*: "That knowledge which through the Soul is a realization of both the known and the Knower is alone esteemed as wisdom." Such Knowledge is that which all men are engaged in seeking, even though they seek in devious channels. It is not to be gained by religion nor by science, by much study or by action. How then? By assuming the position: I am the Knower in this body or in any body; in this world or in any world; in these conditions or in any conditions—and then by the natural thought and conduct which flow from such a position assumed. There is no other way.

THEOSOPHY AND WELFARE WORK

SOMETIMES Theosophists are chided with the fact that they, as groups or societies, are not represented in bodies devoted to what is called welfare work. Every Theosophist knows the answer to this complaint, but in view of the frequent "drives" made by welfare bodies, statements as to the Theosophical position might serve a worthy purpose in directing minds really inclined to true work for humanity.

Binding up wounds, relieving distress of mind or body, or finding or furnishing employment for the needy, all have their place in the scheme of human relations, and when need arises the Theosophist can rise to the occasion as readily as any other. However, that is not his life work. All our so-called troubles are of our own making; but, short of an understanding of the philosophy of Theosophy, few can be made to realize this; hence they repeat the same mistakes and suffer the same results. If the Theosophist can point out the facts of Life, the Law of Cause and Effect in its true continuity, the essential identity of the nature and evolution of each and every being, to a few sincere men who will make use of the knowledge, he has done more real welfare work for humanity than has he who has ministered to the physical needs of great numbers.

The Masters know this, hence Their work with us is to open up our minds to a realization of the truth about ourselves. With the knowledge that is Theirs, They could provide food for the hungry in abundance. However, They seized a greater opportunity and at a time when our minds were hungriest They gave out teachings regarding the cause of all ills, as well as the cause of all good things. If instead of taking the course They did, They had involved Themselves in the actual work of feeding the physically hungry and healing the physically sick, the world's woes would have become greater, since none would have been devoted to teaching men how to regulate their thoughts and actions in harmony with the Law.

When the rendering of material aid is in order and can be given, let each one do what he knows is best to be done. When an opportunity comes to present the facts of Life, Law and Being, which when learned and applied will clear up the cause of humanity's suffering, no organized welfare society can take over the departmental work of the Theosophist.

ON THE LOOKOUT

A Warden on Criminals

Like a reef reared up in the midst of a sea of foam, one occasionally sees an announcement by men of experience, free from theory, contrasted with the limitless materialistic folly commingled with maudlin sentiment which for the most part passes for sociology these days.

An article by John C. Groome, printed in the *Saturday Evening Post,* for January 25, 1930, is well worth reading entire. Mr. Groome is ex-warden of Eastern Penitentiary, Philadelphia. His article is an exposure of the weird mixture of silly sentimentality and brutal inhumanity, between which our prisons and their unfortunate inmates are constantly shuttle-cocked. And in fact the American characteristics which result in these conditions manifest themselves in all our social, political, and ethical relationships.

Here are some of Mr. Groome's views on the criminal himself, together with some sidelights on prison reformers:

> . . . A body of reformers petitioned the governor and the Department of Welfare to put all life prisoners together in a dormitory, instead of locking them in cells, so that they would not be lonely at night.
>
> "Putting lifers," I said, "into a dormitory is the height of cruelty. Do you realize that a man sentenced to prison for the rest of his life and put in a dormitory would not have one single minute to himself as long as he lives, not a moment of privacy for the rest of his life? The dormitory would be like an insane asylum in a year." . . .
>
> Some of the men were professional or semi-professional pugilists in normal life. Some, on the other hand, were clever artists. One inmate, a university graduate, drew the plans for the new cell block which the other inmates built. In fact, we had all types of men except the criminal class.
>
> This does not exist. Environment may have something to do with starting a man toward crime; slums, for example, are bad. Heredity may or may not have something to do with it. But the criminal comes from all types and all classes . . .
>
> I can call to mind no class of society or kind of felon of which we did not have an example at the Eastern Penitentiary. And Lord, the flocks of sociologists we had studying them! Heredity—
>
> "Even if you prove heredity responsible, which you cannot," I used to say, "what are you going to do about it? Prove that this fellow's father was a thief and his mother a prostitute; prove his grandparents were the same, and his great-grand-

parents. All right. This felon has three healthy intelligent children between the ages of six and nine. Even if you know they are going to be thieves and prostitutes, can you imprison them for the rest of their lives? And how can you tell, if heredity counts for so much, that some dim, ministerial ancestor won't upset the apple cart and direct them into the right path after all? What's the good of these careful tables of statistics?"

"Oh," they'd answer, "it adds to the sum total of knowledge. It's information."

I never could find out just what good their prowlings did . . .

YOUTHFUL CRIMINALS

Mr. Groome speaks of crime:

. . . I found out from observation that in the United States we are yearly and by the thousand developing a new kind of law-breaker—the young person of from sixteen to twenty-one years whose first offense is not a misdemeanor but a felony. The most appalling thing about American crime is not the prevalence of crime but the youthfulness of the criminal. When I became warden in 1923 the average age of the sixteen hundred convicts under my charge was forty-one. When I left, only five years later, the average age was thirty-one. In 1927, for example, we had one hundred and ten prisoners less than twenty-one years old; eighty under nineteen; and one, a murderer, of fifteen. The Eastern Penitentiary is a state prison, where offenders are sent for crimes of a serious nature. Many of those young people were serving life sentences. Nor was the Eastern Penitentiary unique in respect to these conditions. The average age of criminals in American penal institutions is still dropping.

People, it will be remembered, at first attributed our recent crime waves to the aftermath of World War influence. This theory explodes when you recall that at the end of the World War our young criminal of today was less than ten years old.

It is not a change in human nature which makes crime in America an everyday occurrence. It is the change in methods of transportation. We had no crime waves until recently, because until comparatively recently people traveled by horse. Home influence, of which there is less now, may formerly have counted somewhat on the side of right. Simpler standards of living counted a good deal. The difficulty of a quick get-away counted most. Slow horses rather than high ethics stood between the potential criminal and his crime.

Today we have more motor cars than two or three other nations put together. We have prohibition, which entails bootlegging, with all the lawlessness directly and indirectly connected with it. We have police forces shot to pieces by boot-

> legger bribes. In short we have the makings of as many crime waves as you please . . .
>
> Whatever the sentences they were serving, whatever their chance of escaping proper punishment or obtaining a just pardon, and whatever causes brought them there, we had too many young people at the Eastern Penitentiary. They constituted both a new kind of criminal and a new kind of prisoner. Guards are beginning to talk of the good old days when the old-fashioned felon took a prison sentence more or less in his stride, obeyed orders as a rule, and usually showed himself amenable to prison discipline. The new young criminal is often a Bolshevik prisoner; a gunman looking for trouble, and as willing to murder a humane guard as not . . .

It is safe to say that fully one-half our modern crimes would be impossible without the use of the automobile. And when or if the airplane becomes popularized, society will be able to survive the advantages given the criminal thereby only because of its preponderating numbers, which are able to bear the burden of parasitic violence without a complete break-down. But we must have our speed, even though after gaining ten minutes on the way home at the risk of our and some hundreds of other lives, we have nothing better to do with the time than read about crime and auto accidents.

Another Warden and Some Opinions

Lewis E. Lawes, Warden of Sing Sing Prison, having, like Mr. Groome, some knowledge of the criminal derived other than from the recesses of a laboratory-cramped brain, states that the men inside prison are fundamentally no different from those outside, even showing in many cases such virtues as fortitude and honor. Psychiatry, he says, has a place; but it has a tendency to over-emphasize the influence of feeble-mindedness and ignorance in criminality. All these are merely possible factors, because the majority of each class are no more criminal than the educated or intelligent. (*New York Times,* Feb. 24, 1929; *Literary Digest,* Jan. 12, 1929).

A report printed in the *Literary Digest* for July 6, 1929, states that trouble among average individuals is not lack of brains but of emotional ability to use them properly. It is said that about two per cent of the population is mentally defective, and that this number produced a quarter to a third of the prison population. This itself means nothing in view of the fact that mental defectiveness is much more productive of a tendency to get caught than it is of crime itself! So long as such a small percentage of malefactors are ever caught in America, such arguments as this will be worse than worthless. Nor

does the report explain the fact noted by two crime commissions, namely, that the inmates of prison show slightly higher intelligence test results than the average outside. One would conclude that the proper thing to do is to keep the average intelligence low so that people will be easier caught when they commit crime! The report named, however, does have the grace to state that the mentally defective are not as prone to crime as had been thought, and that the prisons include many more persons with superior or normal intellects than they do mental defectives. Many defectives, it is said, lead good lives.

But to elucidate that, all that was needed was to use a little common sense in correlating common observations, and above all, a little common humanity. Truly, these ponderous and pompous commissions with their reports, will have to answer a heavy karma for the waste of our diminishing supply of good paper-materials!

CRIME AND THOUGHT

Dr. M. D. Healy, director of the Judge Baker Foundation in Boston (*Literary Digest,* Jan. 19, 1929), says correctly that the cause of crime is ideational. The young bandit, he thinks, gathers his thoughts of criminality from companions or newspapers, dwelling thereon until it becomes an obsession curable only by the major electro-therapy of "The Chair."

In point of fact, our respectable and respected newspapers, which write hair-raising editorials against crime and demand a total reform in our court procedures, etc., as a cure, are themselves one of the chief proximate causes of crime. They can remove themselves from that undesirable category only by an impossible (for them) feat, namely, to omit the details of crime from their columns. They know quite well that they do not sell as many papers unless they "play up" crime. What does that mean? It can and does mean nothing less than that the mass of the people have a thirst for vicarious crime, have minds open and waiting for infection. This in many, many cases necessarily leads to actual crime, though in some cases delayed to future and less inhibited incarnations. But to ask a newspaper to sacrifice circulation for the mere purpose of leaving the race mind cleaner? What an idea!

Dr. Healy in so many words thus shows that a defective use of the will in the matter of controlling thought is the generator of crime. Every man who has tried to break a bad habit knows that, without the necessity for any pundit pronouncements.

But Dr. Healy poisons his whole theme by assuming that the cause of delinquency is not a bad use of the will, but the ideational environment itself. Now of course if one never has evil put before him he will not sin. But that will not make him a pure man; it will merely make him one who hasn't been tempted. Good enough for our present, petty materialistic object of being left unannoyed by as many problems as possible in relation to our fellow-man; but far from good enough in point of that eternal evolution to divinity through all experience, which must be the lot of every ego that is to survive.

A Newspaper's Comments

The New York Sun puts Dr. Healy's fallacy in a nutshell:

> As in many other articles attacking the penal system, one looks in vain for any mention of the human will. Persons of good behavior have it, persons who manage to stay out of prison exercise it, but offenders against the law are puppets of environment. The gunman acts, in Dr. Healy's opinion, because of the suggestions of his companions or because of what he reads in the newspapers. The gunman acts, in fact, because of what he wills to do or wills to have. It must comfort an organism so simple to know that there are Dr. Healys busily at work trying to establish a law of irresponsibility of criminals.

Social Life

The Saturday Evening Post can by no means be accused of a sour outlook upon contemporary American life; on the contrary, it is the glorifier *par excellence* of all things savoring of orthodox optimism.

It is therefore a portentous sign when the *Post* speaks the following:

> Everyone, from the President down, discussed the fall in the market and canvassed its immediate and distant effects. Stock quotations were the universal literature, except perhaps for a humorous skit on the emotions of a sold-out margin speculator, which, in slender book form, reached a circulation of hundreds of thousands soon after its publication . . .
>
> How futile to concern oneself intensively with stock quotations on exchanges in cities ridden by gangsters and criminal rackets of one kind or other! Of what importance is it whether stocks rise or fall if the institution of property, of which shares of corporations are only one of many aspects, is not even moderately safe? What matters it about even the institution of property itself, if life cannot be better protected? . . . For what shall one think after setting over against the absorption of the people in the temporary vagaries of stock prices their complete indifference, apathy and selfishness concerning the tide

> of crime that beats against the very foundations of national life? . . .
>
> There is much talk and fury about research and investigation into the causes of crime. But no solemn fact-finding commissions are needed to find out what is wrong. Crime will continue to become a more and more cancerous growth just as long as public lethargy exists. The citizen who does not care much what happens as long as it does not happen to him, who wants to be let alone, who thinks only of his own convenience and prosperity, and who is indifferent to the defects, the absurdities, the technicalities and the outworn quackeries of the law-enforcement machinery is responsible for the menace of crime . . . (Jan. 11, 1930).

WHERE IS THE HOPE?

Certain cults of the cheerful are fond of pointing out the universal kindliness, honesty, and sympathy of mankind—using hand-picked samples and forgetting that it is one thing to put on a genial face in the midst of well-being, and another to exercise honor, forbearance, and unselfishness under stress. It is true that there is a vast inchoate good nature and brotherliness in the American people. But this is unaccompanied by intelligence, undirected, and so driven and led as to be a menace rather than a virtue. Its chief visible manifestation is tolerance of self-righteous evils which would be wiped off the boards forthwith by any communal sense.

In certain directions there is progress. From the terrible "younger generation," now coming into its majority, is growing a literary school of astonishing fearlessness and blisteringly clear vision, perforce having its genius confined in destructive channels.

Among the foremost men of science, materialism is vanishing, an approach to the *Secret Doctrine* teachings in most lines of science is being made and there are even signs of a burgeoning sense of responsibility for the public use of scientific discovery. But if history is any criterion, public knowledge chronically remains about fifty years behind scientific progress; and this is especially apt to be the case when the trend is upward and not downward.

The peace efforts of President Hoover and Premier MacDonald are at least a recognition of an international pacifist opinion. A peace sentiment based wholly upon selfish recognition of the best means of securing material safety and well-being has nothing of permanence to begin with, and may well sink us into a standard worse than any war.

Absolution by Tonsillectomy

According to the press of Jan. 25, 1930, Dean Shailer Matthews of the University of Chicago, remarked that "what used to be hell may now be merely tonsilitis."

The divinity school of the University of Chicago announced that diagnosis was to become an essential of the ministry in the future. People are no longer to be scared into decent living by hell-fire, it was stated, but to be sent to the proper specialist for cure. "If the purpose of the ministry is the curing of sick souls, then the minister must have some knowledge of how sick minds and bodies create sickness in the soul."

Thus a church which has been consistently descending the long miry path of materialism for two milleniums is reaching its logical finality. From considering the soul as an appanage of the body and mind, to be saved by the edict of an external god or a form of words enunciated by the proper parties, it is most logical to conceive of it as a possession of the body and mind to be saved—if at all—by the use of a surgeon's knife in the hands of the proper parties. For mass fees and box contributions we are now to substitute the doctor's bill as the price of salvation. Verily, the prostitution and materialization of spiritual things is fundamental in human nature, altering only in form.

No doubt the church of the near future will be as impervious to a suggestion that sickness of mind and body derives from sickness of soul, which itself is curable only by decentralization of self, as science is deaf, dumb, and blind to the same proposition.

Dean Matthews remarks that with this step "the paths of science and religion have drawn close together." They have; so close now that it appears that the deluded who have hitherto passed out money right and left in the attempt to purchase well-being for a price, will shortly be passing it out to the left only, but in augmented rather than diminished quantity.

Noise and Strains

Mr. Harry Carr, columnist for the *Los Angeles Times,* says:

> Dr. Foster Kennedy of Cornell Medical College, has found, by experiment, that the noises of a city reduce the vitality of a rat more than 17 per cent. He assumes that humans are likewise affected.
>
> If noise were all . . .
>
> In other ways than noise city life is taking the sap and the sanity out of the human race.

For instance, an amazing number of people have an unreasonable terror of subways, tunnels and elevators; yet they have to ride in these contraptions. The theory used to be that it was noble and proper to force oneself to "do it anyhow." Modern psychologists know that these complexes can sometimes be removed—but never ridden down.

The point that I seem to be trying to make is that modern life offers so many of these artificial strains that we will inevitably turn into a race of neurasthenics. A hopeful sign is, however, that countrymen used to save up their money to go to town to retire. City men now strain to save money to go back to the country. Airplanes and fast automobiles will further this movement. (Jan. 25, 1930).

PLEASURE AND HAPPINESS

If the average man of today were told that there is a radical and fatal difference between pleasure and happiness, he would regard you with a blank stare. Yet Theosophy teaches that happiness is as much an inherent quality of soul as wetness, say, is a quality of water; a quality that soul loses as it loses perception of its own nature. In other words, the pursuit of pleasure is only a crescendo madness which never under any circumstances can lead to happiness, since it is based on a total ignorance of the self-sustaining quality of Soul. Unhappiness is not caused by lack of pleasure; it is caused by pursuit of pleasures.

According to *Science,* Sept. 6, 1929, Prof. Goodwin Watson, experimenting with 400 students, found that intelligence seems to have nothing to do with happiness. Neither, says he, is importance to be attached to race, physical disability, size of one's home, financial, social or educational status of one's family, nor to personal estimates of ability at sports or the arts.

A NEGATIVE ARRIVAL

It is gratifying to find science arriving, even by a negative road, at some understanding of the nature of happiness. But the report brings misgiving on another score.

Science thus starting from the ground up, and making a beginning at the point reached by human experience not less than five thousand years ago by secular history—millions, according to Theosophy; and enunciating as a new and radical truth that which was understood by every sage in history and accepted at least in principle by millions; must we then wait five thousand years more for science to discover

what is already known to every earnest Theosophist in other lines of knowledge as well?

Prosperity and Happiness

The suicide rate for California in 1928 was more than 30 in 100,000. It has been increasing steadily for the last five years, which were the most prosperous years California has yet known. The city of San Diego has the highest suicide rate in the United States, and, at the present time, the highest on the planet. San Diego has the most equable climate in California, and is pre-eminently the Mecca of rich and retired people who have attained worldly success and have nothing on hand but to occupy themselves as they please.

Frederick L. Hoffman, of the Prudential Insurance Co., notes an increase in the suicide rate of the United States for 1928, when it became next highest in history, being 17.5 per 100,000. Out of 156 cities, 88 showed an increase. Dr. Hoffman remarks that this "is a puzzle because of the prevailing prosperity." It is as though one were to remark that an epidemic of digestive disorders "is a puzzle because of the surplus of food."

Utopia?

Practically all efforts have been, in the United States, consolidated in the sole attempt to eliminate effort. The object preached, worked for, and dreamed of, is a state wherein the individual will have all his labor performed by machinery, and where he will have the wherewith to purchase the satisfaction of every desire. This is the new national religion for which the Capitol at Washington has become temple and the President the *Pontifex Maximus*. There are even so-called scientists possessing the perverted hardihood to speak of the "curse of labor."

Prof. C. M. Joad, of Great Britain, where apparently not all brains have suffered a fatal softening under luxury (*The Week's Science,* April 22, 1929), believes that labor-saving machinery and constantly reduced hours of labor threaten civilization with worse evils than war, pestilence, or starvation. All history, he says, is witness thereto. Suicide in the U. S. was once nearly unknown, and is now one of the chief causes of death, especially in New York, where luxury has been most developed. In case our apparent present ambitions are realized, says Prof. Joad, mankind would go to war for relief from boredom if nothing else.

LUNATICS IN ERMINE

Prof. Ezra Bowen, of the Department of Economics of Lafayette College, remarks that "superficial wealth often covers undernourished bodies." In the average large city 25 per cent of the children go to school badly nourished (34 per cent in New York), although their parents have cars, radios, fur coats, etc. The struggle for "higher standards of living" delays marriage, brings birth restriction, also causing a disregard of the fundamental necessities of life. His hypothesis is that population tends to increase directly with wealth, and inversely with the standard of living. In other words, that our falling birth rate in the face of increasing wealth, is due to increasing standards of living. (*Scientific Monthly,* September, 1929).

There is a growing number of irregular unions and a decrease in the number of actual weddings, in the face of an increasing population of healthy people (*Literary Digest,* Jan. 12, 1929), which is a highly demoralizing tendency for the race as a whole. Other authorities point out that it is increasingly hard for young men to get in a position to marry at all; that economic maturity seldom is attained before thirty; although marriage should take place years before; that the supply of cheap labor furnished employers by the entry of women into business has practically ruined the chances for the city office worker to better himself; that when he does marry, he thus now expects his wife to go on working. This naturally results in more women in business, which in turn results in still poorer conditions, etc. And meantime children have to be denied life or turned over to others for rearing, to swell the growing mass of poorly trained and delinquent.

CHILDREN AND DUTY

According to the same number of the *Literary Digest,* French sociologists find that birth control so generally practised in that country is a great crime producer; since it tends to a single child. The only child, they say, grows up with the idea that his wishes must be granted at any cost. When thrown upon the world he often finds too late that the cost is guillotine or penal colony.

Parents who are able to support more than one child, but condemn their only one to the handicaps inherent in that state, would seem to be in nearly the same category as the unnatural mothers who, though physically able, refuse to nurse their babies, for petty social and personal reasons, thereby condemning them to physical and mental inferiority. (*The Week's Science,* Feb. 25, 1929).